

REMARKS

This Reply is responsive to the Office Action mailed on May 19, 2004. Claims 1-11, 13-16, and 18-23 are pending, of which 1, 7, and 11 are independent. Claims 12 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice, claims 11 and 14 have been amended, and new claims 18-23 have been added. No new matter is added.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claim 11 has been amended to include limitations similar to those set forth in claims 1 and 7, and to correct a minor drafting error.

Claim 14 has been amended to eliminate the dependency on claim 12, which has been cancelled.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-17 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,937,160 to Davis et al. ("Davis"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, "retrieving a copy of the web site content based on the named party url; [and] presenting the copy [of the web site content] to a named party." The Action points to Col. 13, line 51 through Col. 14, line 64 as allegedly disclosing these features. This portion of Davis at Col. 13, line 51 through Col. 14, line 64 only describes presenting a user with a "Web page selection screen" from within an "Information Management System (IMS) module," followed by presentation to the user of "attributes associated with the Web page." This passage from Davis does not disclose presentation to the user of the Web page itself, and this passage does not teach presentation to the user of any content on the Web page that is or even can be revised by the user. Only "attributes associated with the Web page" (e.g., "Department responsible for above page," "Person responsible for page content", and the like) can be revised by the user in the IMS module taught by Davis at Col. 13, line 51 through Col. 14, line 64. Nowhere in Davis is there a disclosure or suggestion of retrieving a copy of the web site content based on the named party url and presenting that copy to a named party as set forth in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is considered allowable over Davis.

DOCKET NO.: BELL-0096/00414
Application No.: 09/817,944
Office Action Dated: May 19, 2004

PATENT

Claims 7 and 11 recite similar features as claim 1 and are considered allowable for at least the same reasons.

Moreover, given that claims 3-7, 9-11, and 13-17 contain similar limitations, the examiner's rejection of these claims cannot stand either.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 8 were rejected as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Published Patent Application Number 2003/0028608 ("Patterson"). As noted above, the features of independent claims 1 and 7, from which claims 2 and 8 respectively depend, are not shown by Davis. These features are also missing from Patterson. Therefore, claims 2 and 8 are considered allowable over any combination of Davis and Patterson.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 18-23 have been added to more particularly cover portions of the subject matter contained in paragraphs 8 and 10 of the application (specifying predetermined graphics or text to be updated and mapping rich text format content to hypertext markup language as part of an update, respectively). Again, no new matter is added.

DOCKET NO.: BELL-0096/00414
Application No.: 09/817,944
Office Action Dated: May 19, 2004

PATENT

CONCLUSION

Although not specifically addressed above, Applicant does not concede that any of the other assertions made by the examiner in connection with the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 rejections are proper.

Applicant believes the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully,

Date: August 19, 2004

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David L. Marcus / Steven P.", written over a horizontal line.

David L. Marcus
Registration No. 46,897

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439